UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,472	07/30/2003	Jack E. Ozzie	M1103.70271US02	9188

45840 7590 05/24/2010

WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation)
C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER	
SCOTT, RANDY A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2453	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/24/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/630,472	OZZIE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RANDY SCOTT	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 March 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15,16,18-24,26-28,30,32-34 and 38-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15,16,18-24,26-28,30,32-34 and 38-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to communication filed 3/3/2010

2. Applicant is canceling claims 25, 29 and 31 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 18, 26, 30, 32, 33 and 38 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

3. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 38 should recite a non-transitory computer readable media in order to distinguish the claimed computer readable media from non statutory subject matter, such a signals or carrier waves. The applicant could overcome this rejection by reciting the term "one or more NON-TRANSITORY computer readable media".

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained through the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078).

Regarding claims 1 and 18, Ichimura discloses:

At least two of the plurality of computers used by inviting members to independently assigning unique designations to endpoints of members invited to join the telespace (see col. 4, lines 60-63, which teaches attaching a unique identifier for new users participating in a telemeeting).

Ichimura fails to teach operating at least two of the plurality of computers in the peer-to-peer collaboration system, each designation of an endpoint of an invited member comprising:

(a) a value indicative of the order in which the invited member was invited by a respective inviting member to join the telespace; and

(b) a unique endpoint designation indicative of the respective inviting member; and

order received data change messages based on endpoint designations in the received data change messages.

Engstrom et al teach the specified deficiencies, including operating at least two of the plurality of computers in the peer-to-peer collaboration system, each designation of an endpoint of an invited member (see col. 10, lines 20-24, which discloses a player ID for each virtual player entering the virtual shared session) comprising:

(a) a value indicative of the order in which the invited member was invited by a respective inviting member to join the telespace (see col. 10, lines 3-7, which discloses assigning ID to new players joining a peer gaming session);

(b) a unique endpoint designation indicative of the respective inviting member (see col. 10, lines 13-15, which discloses providing a player ID for newly added virtual players); and

order received data change messages based on endpoint designations in the received data change messages (see col. 10, lines 28-31, which teaches issuing a status change message when a players leaves the session or a new player joins the session).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura with the general concept illustrated by Engstrom et al, in order to effectively implement identification designation within a P2P data sharing system with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching exchanging data amongst peer users in a virtual room.

Regarding claims 2 and 19, Ichimura discloses a unique numeral designation to each endpoint (see col. 5, lines 14-16, which discloses a participant identifier for each potential conference participant).

Regarding claims 3 and 20, Ichimura discloses a unique serial numeral designation for each endpoint wherein the serial numeral designation comprises a series of numbers including the numeral designation of the respective inviting member (see col. 5, lines 4-7, "participant number").

6. Claims 4-5, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078), further in view of Grimm et al (US 5,828,843).

With respect to claims 4 and 21, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach wherein a plurality of the designations of different endpoints each indicates a chain of inviting members.

Grimm et al teach the specified deficiencies, including wherein a plurality of the designations of different endpoints each indicate a chain of inviting members (see col. 10, lines 48-56, which teaches that attributes and values are provided for links and IP addresses of users currently participating in the gaming environment before the requested user joins).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Grimm et al, in order to issue virtual space identifiers for sharing members with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching implementation of a peer to peer data sharing system.

With respect to claims 5 and 22, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach wherein endpoint designations comprise a number of orders, including a first order designating a founding member of the telespace, and at least a second order designating a member invited to join the telespace by the founding member.

Grimm et al teach the specified deficiencies, including wherein endpoint designations comprise a number of orders, including a first order designating a founding member of the telespace (see col. 10, lines 59-67, which teaches that the match making mechanism creates records and metrics for the first member of a peer to peer gaming virtual room) and at least a

second order designating a member invited to join the telespace by the founding member (see col. 11, lines 1-3, "requests from other clients").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concepts illustrated by Grimm et al, in order to specify the initial member of a shared virtual space with the motivation previously addressed.

7. Claims 6 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078), further in view of Shear et al (US 6,112,181).

With respect to claims 6 and 23, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach assigning, by the founding member, each of a plurality of endpoints corresponding to a new member of the telespace invited into the telespace by the founding member a unique designation comprising the first order digit of the founding telespace member, and a second order digit, the second order digits of the designations of endpoints of the new members being in a sequential order indicating the order in which the new members joined the telespace.

Shear et al teach the specified deficiencies, including assigning, by the founding member, each of a plurality of endpoints corresponding to a new member of the telespace invited into the telespace by the founding member a unique designation comprising the first order digit of the founding telespace member (see col. 52, lines 1-5, "user or group ID field," also see col. 18, lines –11, which teaches that the method pertains to an online gaming environment)

, and a second order digit, the second order digits of the designations of endpoints of the new members being in a sequential order indicating the order in which the new members joined the telespace (see col. 53, lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concepts illustrated by Shear et al, in order to sufficiently assign identification for original members of a telemeeting with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching regulation of a peer to peer data exchange network.

8. Claims 7-10 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078) and Shear et al (US 6,112,181), further in view of Sharpe et al (US 5,898,834).

With respect to claims 7 and 24, Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al fail to teach inserting endpoint designations into data change requests (see col. 14, lines 56-59, which teaches a change request in relation to the client pairing with the service providing mechanism).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al with the general concept illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to assign identifiers for users entering a virtual room with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching shared space data provisioning.

With respect to claims 8 and 25, Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al fail to teach using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests.

The general concept of using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests (see col. 13, lines 9-12, which teaches a detecting a collision due to data request conflict and the resulting processed action) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al with the general concept illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network with the motivation previously addressed.

With respect to claims 9 and 26, Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al fail to teach resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering.

The general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering (see col. 16, lines 42-45) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al with the general concept illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to efficiently order leaf nodes in a shared space with the motivation previously addressed.

With respect to claims 10 and 27, Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al fail to teach comparing endpoint digits on an order-by-order basis; and scheduling data change requests so that data change requests with the lowest endpoint digits in the lowest orders are scheduled for processing first.

The general concept of comparing endpoint digits on an order-by-order basis (see col. 16, lines 42-45); and scheduling data change requests so that data change requests with the lowest endpoint digits in the lowest orders are scheduled for processing first (see col. 14, lines 50-55, which teaches determining the order in which the actions are to be implemented) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura, Engstrom et al, and Shear et al with the general concept illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently regulate a peer to peer data exchange network.

9. Claims 11-13, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078), further in view of Sharpe et al (US 5,898,834).

With respect to claims 11 and 28, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach inserting endpoint designations into data change requests.

The general concept of inserting endpoint designations into data change requests (see col. 14, lines 55-60) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently identify change requests within a data exchange network with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching shared transmitted data access.

With respect to claims 12 and 29, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests.

The general concept of using the endpoint designations in data change requests to resolve a dependency collision between two data requests (see col. 16, lines 42-45) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to sufficiently implement collision detection between shared data requests with the motivation previously addressed.

With respect to claims 13 and 30, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering.

The general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering (see col. 13, lines 10-12) is well known in the art as illustrated by Sharpe et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Sasaki et al with the general concept of resolving a dependency collision while maintaining total ordering, as illustrated by Sharpe et al, in order to efficiently queue specified data for ordering purposes with the motivation previously addressed.

10. Claims 16, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078), further in view of Golberg et al (US 5,823,879).

With respect to claim 31, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach assigning a unique designation to each new telespace member that an inviting endpoint invites into the telespace.

Goldberg et al teach the specified deficiencies, including assigning a unique designation to each new telespace member that an inviting endpoint invites into the telespace (see col. 28, lines 60-67, which discloses the identifier assigned to a new user joining the gaming lobby, shown in col. 28, lines 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Goldberg et al, in order to successfully

implement a virtual gaming lobby with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching user identification in a shared virtual space.

With respect to claims 15 and 32, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the telespace.

Goldberg et al teach the specified deficiencies (see col. 8, lines 1-5, "unique player identification code").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Goldberg et al, in order to successfully implement a virtual data sharing lobby with the motivation previously addressed.

With respect to claims 16 and 33, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach the inviting member assigning an endpoint designation that is unique within the collaboration system.

Goldberg et al teach the specified deficiencies (see col. 8, lines 1-5, "unique player identification code").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Goldberg et al, in order to successfully

implement unique designations within virtual gaming lobby with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching peer shared data collaboration.

11. Claims 34 is rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ichimura (US 6,573,926) in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078), further in view of Valencia (US 5,918,019).

With respect to claim 34, Ichimura and Engstrom et al disclose the limitations previously addressed.

Ichimura and Engstrom et al fail to teach using a pseudo-random number generator to generate each designation.

Valencia teaches the specified deficiencies (see col. 10, lines 5-9, which discloses random number challenges for endpoint authentication).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ichimura and Engstrom et al with the general concept illustrated by Valencia, in order to successfully create virtual space identification values.

12. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Grossglauser et al (US 6,353,596) in view of Gubbi (US 6,480,506), further in view of Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078).

Regarding claim 38, Grossglauser et al disclose:

Receiving an invitation for the invited member to join the shared telespace (see col. 12, lines 4-7, which teaches inviting a member to join a multicasting session), the invitation being

sent by an inviting member of the plurality of members having an inviting member endpoint designation (see col. 3, lines 23-25, which discloses specifying identifiers for senders and receivers in the multicast group and col. 5, lines 30-34, which discloses that the virtual connections are set up between endpoints); and the invited member endpoint designation having a hierarchical representation with a first portion identifying the inviting member endpoint designation (see col. 11, lines 52-57, which discloses a tree hierarchy structure for members joining the multicast group).

Grossglauser et al fail to teach receiving from a computer of the inviting member of the peer-to-peer collaboration system an invited member endpoint designation for the invited member, a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace; and transmitting change messages indicating changes to the shared telespace, each change message comprising the invited member endpoint designation.

Gubbi teaches specified deficiencies, including receiving from a computer of the inviting member of the peer-to-peer collaboration system an invited member endpoint designation for the invited member (see col. 12, lines 28-32, which discloses that subnets that accepts invitations are assigned and SS-ID) and a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace (see col. 4, lines 28-32, which discloses transmission times for master and client devices that share the wireless channel).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Grossglauser et al with the general concept illustrated by Gubbi, in order to effectively establish identified

initiators and invitees in a shared multicastin network with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching shared communication data channels.

Grossglauser et al and Gubbi fail to teach transmitting change messages indicating changes to the shared telespace, each change message comprising the invited member endpoint designation.

Engstrom et al teach the specified deficiencies (see col. 10, lines 28-31, which teaches issuing a status change message when a player leaves the session or a new player joins the session).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Grossglauser et al and Gubbi with the general concept illustrated by Engstrom et al, in order to effectively implement identification designation within a P2P data sharing system with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching exchanging data amongst peer users in a virtual room.

Regarding claim 39, Grossglauser et al and Gubbi fail to teach wherein the second portion of the invited member endpoint designation comprises a sequence number generated by the inviting member.

Engstrom et al teach the specified deficiencies (see col. 24, lines 30-34, which obtaining strings within the play interface).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Grossglauser et al and Gubbi with the general concept illustrated by Engstrom et al, in order to effectively implement a sequence of numbers or strings to identify parties in the peer to peer network with the motivation previously addressed.

Regarding claim 40, Grossglauser et al disclose:

Inviting a second member to join the telespace (see col. 12, lines 4-7, which teaches inviting a member to join a multicasting session); and providing to a computer of the second invited member a second invited member designation (see col. 3, lines 23-25, which discloses specifying identifiers for senders and receivers in the multicast group and col. 5, lines 30-34, which discloses that the virtual connections are set up between endpoints), the second invited member designation having a hierarchical representation (see col. 11, lines 52-57, which discloses a tree hierarchy structure for members joining the multicast group).

Grossglauser et al fail to teach receiving from a computer of the inviting member of the peer-to-peer collaboration system an invited member endpoint designation for the invited member, a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace; and transmitting change messages indicating changes to the shared telespace, each change message comprising the invited member endpoint designation.

Gubbi teaches specified deficiencies, including receiving from a computer of the inviting member of the peer-to-peer collaboration system an invited member endpoint designation for the invited member (see col. 12, lines 28-32, which discloses that subnets that accepts invitations are assigned and SS-ID) and a second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace (see col. 4, lines 28-32, which discloses transmission times for master and client devices that share the wireless channel).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Grossglauser et al with the general concept illustrated by Gubbi, in order to effectively establish identified initiators and invitees in a shared multicastin network with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching shared communication data channels.

Grossglauser et al and Gubbi fail to teach transmitting change messages indicating changes to the shared telespace, each change message comprising the invited member endpoint designation.

Engstrom et al teach the specified deficiencies (see col. 10, lines 28-31, which teaches issuing a status change message when a player leaves the session or a new player joins the session).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Grossglauser et al and Gubbi with the general concept illustrated by Engstrom et al, in order to effectively implement identification designation within a P2P data sharing system with the motivation of providing the benefit of teaching exchanging data amongst peer users in a virtual room.

13. Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/3/10 have been fully considered but are moot in view of newly added prior art references.

A. In response to the applicant's argument that Sasaki ET al (US 5,667,440) fails to teach or suggest at least two of the plurality of computers in the peer-to-peer collaboration system, the at least two of the plurality of computers used by inviting members to independently assign unique designations or order received change messages based on endpoint designations in the received data change messages:

Applicant's argument has been taken into consideration; however, prior art reference Engstrom et al (US 6,463,078) has been cited, which teaches the deficiencies of Sasaki. Engstrom et al teach the specified deficiencies, including operating at least two of the plurality of computers in the peer-to-peer collaboration system, each designation of an endpoint of an invited member (see col. 10, lines 20-24, which discloses a player ID for each virtual player entering the virtual shared session) comprising a value indicative of the order in which the invited member was invited by a respective inviting member to join the telespace (see col. 10, lines 3-7, which discloses assigning ID to new players joining a peer gaming session); a unique endpoint designation indicative of the respective inviting member (see col. 10, lines 13-15, which discloses providing a player ID for newly added virtual players); and order received data change messages based on endpoint designations in the received data change messages (see col. 10, lines 28-31, which teaches issuing a status change message when a players leaves the session or a new player joins the session).

B. In response to the applicant's argument that neither Gudjonsson nor Hertzog describes a peer-to-peer collaboration system that assigns and uses end point designations, hierarchical representation with a first portion identifying the inviting member endpoint designation and a

second portion identifying when the invited member was invited to join the shared telespace relative to when the inviting member invited other members to join the shared telespace, or transmitting change messages indicating changes to the shared telespace, each change message comprising the invited member endpoint designation:

Applicant's argument has been considered; however, prior art reference Grossglauser et al (US 6,353,596) has been cite, which teaches a multipoint, multicasting embodiment that allows for members of shared sessions to invite other members to join a particular multipoint virtual connection room. Grossglauser et al also discloses inviting a second member to join the telespace (see col. 12, lines 4-7, which teaches inviting a member to join a multicasting session); and providing to a computer of the second invited member a second invited member designation (see col. 3, lines 23-25, which discloses specifying identifiers for senders and receivers in the multicast group and col. 5, lines 30-34, which discloses that the virtual connections are set up between endpoints), the second invited member designation having a hierarchical representation (see col. 11, lines 52-57, which discloses a tree hierarchy structure for members joining the multicast group).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy A. Scott whose telephone number is (571) 272-3797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30 am-5:00 pm, second Fridays 7:30 am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RANDY SCOTT/

Examiner, Art Unit 2453

20100425

/Philip J Chea/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453